

FILED
CLERK

1:11 pm, Sep 05, 2019

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
LONG ISLAND OFFICE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
DANIELLE PERTUSIELLO,

Plaintiff,

-against-

ORDER
16-CV-2931 (SJF)(AYS)

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK, POLICE OFFICER
EDWIN WARD, in his individual and official
capacities, JOHN DOE POLICE OFFICER #1,
in his individual and official capacities, JOHN
DOE POLICE OFFICER # 2, in his individual and
official capacities, and JANE DOE POLICE
OFFICER # 1, in her individual and official
capacities,

Defendants.

-----X
FEUERSTEIN, District Judge:

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of the Honorable Anne Y. Shields, United States Magistrate Judge, dated August 19, 2019 (“the Report”), (1) recommending that the motion of defendants County of Suffolk, Police Officer Edwin Ward, John Doe Police Officers #1 and #2 and Jane Doe Police Officer #1 (collectively, “defendants”) for summary judgment pursuant to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure be granted; and (2) advising, *inter alia*, (a) that “[a]ny written objections to th[e] Report . . . must be filed . . . within fourteen (14) days of filing of th[e] [R]eport,” (Report at 21) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) and Rule 72(b)), and (b) that “[f]ailure to file objections within fourteen (14) days will preclude further review of th[e] [R]eport . . . either by the District Court or Court of Appeals.” (*Id.*) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 145, 106 S. Ct. 466, 88 L. Ed. 2d 435 (1985); *Caidor v. Onondaga Cnty.*, 517 F.3d 601, 604 (2d Cir. 2008)). A copy of the Report was served upon counsel for all parties via ECF on August 19, 2019. (See Docket Entry [“DE”] 42).

No party has filed any timely objections to the Report, nor sought an extension of time to do so. For the reasons set forth below, the Report is accepted in its entirety.

I. Standard of Review

Any party may serve and file written objections to a report and recommendation of a magistrate judge on a dispositive matter within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy thereof. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). Any portion of such a report and recommendation to which a timely objection has been made is reviewed *de novo*. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). The court, however, is not required to review the factual findings or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to which no proper objections are interposed. *See Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 150, 106 S. Ct. 466. Where a party “received clear notice of the consequences of the failure to object” to a report and recommendation on a dispositive matter, *Frank v. Johnson*, 968 F.2d 298, 300 (2d Cir. 1992) (quotations and citation omitted); *accord Mario v. P&C Food Mkts., Inc.*, 313 F.3d 758, 766 (2d Cir. 2002); *Small v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 892 F.2d 15, 16 (2d Cir. 1989), his “failure to object timely to [that] report waives any further judicial review of the report.” *Frank*, 968 F.2d at 16; *see also Smith v. Campbell*, 782 F.3d 93, 102 (2d Cir. 2015); *Caidor v. Onondago County*, 517 F.3d 601, 604 (2d Cir. 2008).

Nonetheless, the waiver rule is non-jurisdictional and, thus, the Court may excuse a violation thereof “in the interests of justice.” *Neita v. Precision Pipeline Sols.*, 768 F. App’x 12, 14 (2d Cir. Apr. 29, 2019) (summary order) (citing *United States v. Male Juvenile (95-CR-1074)*, 121 F.3d 34, 39 (2d Cir. 1997)); *see also DeLeon v. Strack*, 234 F.3d 84, 86 (2d Cir. 2000). “Such discretion is exercised based on, among other factors, whether the defaulted argument has

substantial merit or, put otherwise, whether the magistrate judge committed plain error in ruling against the defaulting party.” *Spence v. Superintendent, Great Meadow Corr. Facility*, 219 F.3d 162, 174 (2d Cir. 2000); *accord Neita*, 768 F. App’x at 14.

II. Review of Report

Since no party has filed any timely objections to Magistrate Judge Shields’s Report, nor sought an extension of time to do so, they have “waive[d] any further judicial review of the findings contained in the [R]eport.” *Spence*, 219 F.3d at 174. As the Report is not plainly erroneous, the Court will not exercise its discretion to excuse the parties’ default in filing timely objections to the Report in the interests of justice. Accordingly, the Report is accepted in its entirety and, for the reasons set forth therein, defendants’ motion for summary judgment pursuant to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is granted and defendants are granted judgment as a matter of law dismissing this action in its entirety with prejudice.

III. Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, the Report is accepted in its entirety and, for the reasons set forth therein, defendants’ motion for summary judgment pursuant to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is granted and defendants are granted judgment as a matter of law dismissing this action in its entirety with prejudice. The Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment in favor of defendants and close this case.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ *Sandra J. Feuerstein*
SANDRA J. FEUERSTEIN
United States District Judge

Dated: September 5, 2019
Central Islip, New York